



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,271	12/28/2001	Steven G. Smith	BS00-355	2770

28970 7590 07/30/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ZEWDU, MELESS NMN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683
DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,271

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Meless N Zewdu

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is the first on the merit of the instant application.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis (US 2002/0103851 A1).

As per claim 1: the admitted prior art discloses receiving a transaction request from a supervisor (see fig. 1, elements 160 and 110; page 2, paragraph 0004); interacting with one or more resources to execute the transaction request (see fig. 1; page 2, paragraph 0004); providing a feedback to the supervisor in response to the transaction request through the remote device (see fig. 1; page 2, paragraph 0004). The fact that the technician responds to the supervisor can be considered a feedback. Also, the networks elements used by the supervisor and the technician can be considered resources. But, the APA does not explicitly teach about receiving a login request from the supervisor,

determining the supervisor is authorized user and receiving transaction request from the supervisor if the supervisor is an authorized user, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Kikinis teaches about a wireless enabled digital phone and a WAP gateway (see page 2, paragraphs 0015-0016, 0022-0023) wherein the WAP gateway receives a login request and perform security check (authentication) before delivering service to a requesting wireless device (see page 3, paragraph 0036, also see page 3, paragraphs 00030-0035). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the APA with the teaching of Kikinis for the advantage of providing faster, and more streamlined access to information requested by small businesses while security is enhanced from behind a security firewall (see page 1, paragraphs 0002-0004).

As per claim 2: the method wherein the remote device is a telephone reads on APA (see fig. 1, elements 110 and 160) both of whom uses telephones. Also (see page 2, paragraph 0004).

As per claim 6: the method wherein the remote device is a wireless device reads on APA (see fig. 1, elements 110 and 160; page 2, paragraph 0004).

As per claim 7: the method wherein the login request includes a mobile identification number associated with the wireless device reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

As per claim 8: the method further comprising the step of comparing the mobile identification number with registered mobile identification number associated with authorized users reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

Art Unit: 2683

As per claim 9: the method wherein the resources include one or more of a legacy system, an intranet, and the internet reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraphs 0028-0032).

As per claim 10: the method wherein the resources include one or more of a security information management system, an out side plant construction management system, a loop qualification system, a work activity statistical sampling system, a fleet operation support system, a fleet optimizer system, an integrated technician performance system, a network monitoring and analysis system, a proactive maintenance administration system, an integrated dispatch system, a mechanized time reporting system, an employee scheduling program, an open system interconnect platform, an out side plant engineering design system reads on APA (see fig. 1, elements 150 and 152; page 1, paragraph 0002-page 2, paragraph 0004). When the APA is modified by Kikinis, as shown above, the modified system will be capable of including at least one or more of the following: an integrated technician performance system, an integrated dispatch system and a proactive maintenance administration system.

As per claim 11: the difference between the features of claim 1 and 11 is that the first is a method claim and the second is an apparatus claim. Besides the similarity of the features of both claims 1 and 11, the apparatus claim 11 is expected to operate or perform the steps of the method claim 1. Hence, claim 11 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 1.

As per claim 12: the system wherein the mobile gateway interface is adapted to determine whether the supervisor is an authorized user of the system reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

As per claim 13: a system wherein the mobile gateway interface comprises one or more of a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server reads on '851 (see figs. 1 and 2; page 3, paragraph 0033). At least, the one condition has been met.

As per claim 14: the system, wherein the mobile gateway interface further comprises a data base, wherein the database is accessible by one or both of the front-end voice server and the front-end data server, and wherein the database includes user information associated with the supervisor reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraphs 0033-0036). The prior art shows the one (data server) of the one or both of the front-end voice server and the front-end data server.

As per claim 15: the system wherein the transaction server processes a transaction request received from the supervisor using the remote device if the supervisor is an authorized user reads on '851 (see page 3, paragraph 0036). When the APA is modified by the teaching of Kikinis, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, the transaction requested by the supervisor, using the wireless device 120, (see APA fig. 1, element 110) will be processed based upon determination as to the supervisor is an authorized user of the system.

As per claim 16: the APA discloses a transaction server interface between a remote device and one or more resources during the communications session to process a transaction request received from a supervisor, wherein the resources are related to technicians associated with the supervisor (see fig. 1, particularly, elements 110 and 160; page 1, paragraph 0002-page 2, paragraph 0036). But, the APA does not explicitly teach about a transaction server coupled to a front-end servers wherein one or more front-end servers (are) adapted to determine whether a supervisor who submits a login request through the remote device during a communication session is authorized user and providing service if the requesting supervisor is authorized user, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Kikinis teaches about WAP (wireless application protocol) enabled digital phone/s capable of accessing a network via WAP GW (gateway) wherein the gateway (see entire document, particularly, fig. 1, elements 108, 105, 104; page 1, paragraph 0008-page 2, paragraph 0016; page 2, paragraphs 0021-0023; page 3, paragraphs 0034-0036). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the APA with the teaching of Kikinis for the advantage of providing faster, and more streamlined access to information requested by small businesses while security is enhanced from behind a security firewall (see page 1, paragraphs 0002-0004).

As per claim 17: the mobile gateway wherein the resources include one or more of a security information management system, an out side plant construction management system, a loop qualification system, a work activity statistical sampling system, a fleet

Art Unit: 2683

operation support system, a fleet optimizer system, an integrated technician performance system, a network monitoring and analysis system, a proactive maintenance administration system, an integrated dispatch system, a mechanized time reporting system, an employee scheduling program, an open system interconnect platform, an out side plant engineering design system reads on APA (see fig. 1, elements 150 and 152; page 1, paragraph 0002-page 2, paragraph 0004). When the APA is modified by Kikinis, as shown above, the modified system will be capable of including at least one or more of the following: an integrated technician performance system, an integrated dispatch system and a proactive maintenance administration system.

As per claim 19: the mobile gateway interface wherein one of the front-end servers is a data server reads on '851 (page abstract; page 3, paragraph 0036).

As per claim 20: the mobile gateway further comprising a database accessible to the front-end servers, wherein the data base includes user information associated with authorized users of the mobile gateway interface reads on (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

As per claim 21: the APA discloses a method of allowing a supervisor to perform transaction using one or more resources related to technicians (see fig. 1, elements 110 and 160; page 1, paragraph 0002-page 2, paragraph 0004). The prior art (fig. 1) clearly shows a supervisor accessing a communications network 130 for being able to communicate with a maintenance center (150) which is connected to a dispatch system (152). Since the claim calls for one or more supervisors, one shown in the prior art (fig.

Art Unit: 2683

1, element 110) satisfies the claimed feature. But the APA does not explicitly teach about registering user information, receiving a login request from the supervisor and reviewing the identity information to determine whether the identity information matches the user information, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Kikinis teaches about a wireless enabled digital phone and a WAP gateway (see page 2, paragraphs 0015-0016, 0022-0023) wherein the WAP gateway receives a login request and perform security check (authentication) using lookup functions before delivering service to a requesting wireless device (see page 3, paragraph 0036, also see page 3, paragraphs 000030-0035). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the APA with the teaching of Kikinis for the advantage of providing faster, and more streamlined access to information requested by small business while security is enhanced from behind a security firewall (see page 1, paragraphs 0002-0004).

As per claim 22: the features of claim 22 are similar to the features of claim 17.

Particularly, those features associated with the supervisor and the technician. For, example, the supervisor first has to find the technician in order to communicate any message. So, **locating a technician**, indicates that one of the at least one or more criteria has been met. Hence, Claim 22 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 17.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1, 11 above, and further in view of Matsumoto et al. (Matsumoto) (US 6,678,720 B1).

As per claim 3: but, the above references do not explicitly teach about a method wherein the login request includes one or more of a user ID and a password spoken by the supervisor, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Matsumoto teaches about an authentication means wherein a user authentication is performed by comparing user stored ID with user's spoken password (see col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 8; fig. 3; col. 4, line 28-col. 6, line 27; col. 8, lines 12-64, particularly, lines 27-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the above references with the teaching of Matsumoto for the advantage of preventing a user data leaking to a third party (see col. 4, lines 28-67, particularly lines 28-39).

As per claim 4: the method further comprising the step of comparing characteristics of the supervisor's voice with voice exemplars of authorized users reads on '720 (see col. 4, lines 28-39; col. 8, lines 27-54).

As per claim 5: the method wherein the transaction request is a spoken command provided by the supervisor reads on '720 (see col. 4, lines 28-39; col. 8, lines 27-54). When the references are combined as shown above, the spoke command would be that of the user otherwise the supervisor of the APA (see fig. 1, element 110).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above references, as applied to claims 1 and 11-13 above, and further in view of Karlsson et al. (Karlsson) (US 6,22,819 B1).

As per claim 18: but, the above references do not explicitly teach about a mobile gateway interface, wherein one of the front-end servers is a voice server, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Karlsson teaches that a voice gateway server can be provided to interface between GMSC and the internet/intranet or other IP communication network (see col. 3, line 42-col. 4, line 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the above references with the teaching of Karlsson for the advantage of routing voice telephone calls received by a mobile radio network to a destination station via an Internet protocol communication network on a data packet channel (see col. 1, lines 8-13)..

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5418. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meless Zewdu

M. Z.

Examiner

21 July 2004.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600